



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,800	10/19/2004	Bernard Hunt	GB 020049	4796

24737 7590 09/19/2006

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS  
P.O. BOX 3001  
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

CHOW, JEFFREY J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2628

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/511,800	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HUNT, BERNARD	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jeffrey J. Chow	<b>Art Unit</b> 2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE \_\_\_\_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 October 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 23 August 2006 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections with respect to claims 6 – 9 have been withdrawn due to the amendments of claim 6.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, and 9 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ikeda (JP 09-083981).

Art Unit: 2628

revolution means, (paragraphs 13 – 15), which reads on the claimed electronic display comprising a screen and circuitry for providing display data to the screen. Ikeda discloses a first mode where the image is unrotated (Drawing 1c) and a second mode where the image is rotated 90° (paragraph 67 Drawing 1d), which reads on the claimed first mode in which display data is provided the screen for viewing in a first orientation and a second mode in which display data is provided to the screen for viewing in a second, orthogonal, orientation. Ikeda discloses a first image that takes up the whole screen in the first mode (Drawing 1c), which reads on the claimed the display data in the first mode comprises a first image. Ikeda discloses a second and a third image in the second mode (Drawing 1d), which reads on the claimed display data in the second mode comprises second and third images for occupying different areas of the screen. Ikeda discloses at least one the second and third images in the second mode having a different size from the first image in the first mode (Drawings 1c and 1d), which reads on the claimed at least one of the second and third images has a different size than the first image. Ikeda discloses a the display screen has an aspect ratio of 3:4, two images in a mode having an aspect ratio of 1.5:2, and two images in another mode having an aspect ratio of 2:8/3 and where all these aspect ratios are equivalent to 3:4 (paragraph 69 and Drawing 13), which reads on the claimed at least one of the second and third images has the same aspect ratio as the first image.

Regarding independent claim 6, claim 6 is similar in scope as to claim 1, thus the rejection for claim 1 is applicable to claim 6.

Regarding dependent claims 4 and 7, Ikeda discloses the two images in the second mode where the two images takes up the width of the screen and the two images are on top of each

other (Drawing 1d), which reads on the claimed second and third images are provided one above the other and occupy substantially the full width of the screen in the second orientation.

Regarding dependent claim 9, Ikeda discloses ON and OFF signals to when to display a self-portrait only or to display a self-portrait and a partner portrait (paragraphs 66 and 67), which reads on the claimed step of determining whether to display according to a first or second mode of operation comprises receiving an instruction from a user of the device.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Ikeda discloses at least one of the two images in the second mode is reduced to fill the width of the screen in the second mode (Drawing 1d), which reads on the claimed at least one of the second and third images is reduced to substantially fill a width of the screen.

Regarding dependent claim 11, Ikeda discloses identical aspect ratio of 3:4 for two images (Drawing 13), which reads on the claimed the second and third images have identical aspect ratios.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Ikeda discloses at least one of the two images in the second mode is reduced to fill the width of the screen in the second mode and two images have identical aspect ratio of 3:4 (Drawing 1d and 13), which reads on the claimed the second and third images are reduced to fill a width of the screen and have identical aspect ratios.

Regarding dependent claims 13 and 15, Ikeda discloses a the display screen has an aspect ratio of 3:4, two images in a mode having an aspect ratio of 1.5:2, and two images in another mode having an aspect ratio of 2:8/3 and where all these aspect ratios are equivalent to 3:4 (paragraph 69 and Drawing 13), which reads on the claimed at least one of the second and third images has a same aspect ratio as the screen.

Regarding dependent claims 14 and 16, Ikeda discloses an image filling the display screen (Drawing 1c), which reads on the claimed first image substantially fills the screen.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda (JP 09-083981).

Regarding dependent claims 2 and 3, Ikeda did not explicitly disclose the specific aspect ratio of 16:9 and 1.4:1 but Ikeda did disclose rotating the screen by 90° with aspect ratio of 3:4. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ikeda's system with any given aspect ratio. One would be motivated to do so because this would be compatible with multiple screen sizes and image sizes.

Claims 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda (JP 09-083981) in view of Buxton (US 6,115,025).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Ikeda did not expressly disclose the display screen is rotatable. Buxton discloses the change in orientation of the user interface with respect to the change in orientation of the display (column 4, lines 26 and 27 and Figures 3a – 3b). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

Art Unit: 2628

Ikeda's system by having a rotatable display. One would be motivated to do so because this would allow a freely movable display to fit with the user's desired orientation and position (Buxton, column 1, lines 7 – 14).

Regarding dependent claim 8, Ikeda did not expressly disclose the switching between the first mode and the second mode is automatic, however Ikeda discloses a rotation of the display by 90° and rotating the image by 90° along with the display (Drawings 1c and 1d). Buxton discloses the operation of switching display mode is automatic that is dependent on the orientation of the display screen (column 5, lines 25 – 51). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ikeda's system by having modes being switched automatically with the display orientation. One would be motivated to do so because this would allow a freely movable display to fit with the user's desired orientation and position (Buxton, column 1, lines 7 – 14).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey J. Chow whose telephone number is (571)-272-8078. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10:00AM - 5:00PM (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ulka Chauhan can be reached on (571)-272-7782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JJC



ULKA CHAUHAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER